

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Food Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAFSAT_12285
Title of the Manuscript:	PROXIMATE, PHYSICAL AND SENSORY CHARACTERISTICS OF ENRICHED CAKE PRODUCED FROM WHEAT AND TIGER NUT FLOUR BLENDS
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Introduction: This section is straightforward, but it would be more interesting if the authors provided more information of the application of tiger nut in bakery product or the novelty of tiger nut in food product.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>>>>2.1 Sample preparation: Could you provide more detailed information about the cake-making process and the specific ingredients used in this study?</p> <p>>>>2.4 Sensory Evaluation: Please give more information about the serving preparation (size or amount of cake) of this study.</p> <p>>>>2.5 Statistical Analysis: Please give more information about the experimental design of this study</p> <p>>>> Please check and use the same type of letter consistently. ($p < 0.05$) or ($P < 0.05$)</p> <p>Results and Discussion: It would be better if the authors rearranged the order of subtitles in line with the order of subtitles in the Method section.</p> <p>>>> Table 2: What is the unit of the values? Please check Hardness, Cohesiveness,</p>	

	<p>Springiness. The proper unit for hardness given in Table 2 is “g”.</p> <p>>>> 3.1 Physical Properties of the cake: For more details, please correlate the nutritional value in Part 3.0 with the changes in the analyzed physical quality.</p> <p>>>> 3.2 Sensory evaluation: As the author suggests, samples with a 90:10 (wheat: tiger nut) cake showed a high sensory score, but there were no significant differences among the samples. So the statistical result suggests adding tiger nut to the cake at a ratio of 80:20 (wheat:tiger nut). It would be clearer if the authors provided more information on the optimum level of tiger nut.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>>>> Notes information under Table 2 and Table 3: Please check A, B, C, D and E are as defined in Table. this statement can be misleading. What exactly does “E” stand for?</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>		
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>		

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suteera Vatthanakul
Department, University & Country	Thammasat University, Thailand